DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 328 HE 018 356

AUTHOR Seagren, Alan T.; Creswell, John W.
TITLE A Comparison of Perceptions of Administrative Tasks and Professional Development Needs of Chairpersons/Heads of Departments in Australia and the U.S.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Pan-Pacific Conference (Seoul, Korea, May 13-16, 1985). Appendix contains small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Responsibility; *Comparative Education; *Department Heads; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Professional Development; Staff Development; *State Colleges; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Australia; *United States

ABSTRACT

Management tasks of department chairs and their perceived needs for staff development were studied in Australian Colleges of Advanced Education (CAE), U.S. state colleges, and a U.S. university. Data were obtained from 679 Australian and 98 U.S. department heads, using similar instruments developed by the Nebraska-Lincoln Task Force on Management Practices in Higher Education. The university differed from the CAEs and state colleges in emphasizing graduate education, offering more majors, and enrolling more students. Respondents indicated whether 61 tasks were part of their responsibilities and whether they needed professional development on the tasks. The tasks can be categorized as: budget planning, development and control, student relations, human relations and personnel administration, internal/external relations, internal administration, personal/professional development, and curriculum and instruction. Findings include: Australian chairs engaged in fewer tasks than the U.S. chairs; university chairs engaged in fewer tasks than state college chairs; and Australian chairs did not engage in the budget planning, development and control, and student relations tasks. Additional findings and a comparison with past studies are presented. A 29-item reference list, 3 tables, and an appendix showing frequency distribution of responses by task conclude the document. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED257328

# A COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS OF CHAIRPERSONS/HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS IN AUSTRALIA AND THE U.S.

Dr. Alan T. Seagren
Vice President for Administration
and Professor of Educational
Administration
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68583
U.S.A.
(402) 472-2191

Dr. John W. Creswell
Associate Professor
Department of Educational
Administration
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588
U.S.A.
(402) 472-3726

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alan T. Seagren

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE018 356

A contributed paper for the Pan-Pacific Conference, Seoul, Korea, May 13-16, 1985.

## Abstract

This study tests whether department chair tasks and professional development needs are generalizable between Australian and U.S. colleges. More specifically, it compares perceptions of chairs from Australian C.A.E.'s, U.S. state coleges, and a U.S. university in (1) the types of professional tasks in which chairs engage and (2) needs of chairs for professional development on tasks. The data base consists of a secondary analysis of Australian and U.S. data sets about chairs that utilizes the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Task Force on Management Practices in Higher Education survey of department chairs. Results report similiarities and differences among Australian C.A.E., U.S. state college, and U.S. university chairs in the extent which they engage in 61 management tasks and their perceived needs for staff development on the tasks. Based on these results, the authors discuss the implication for generalizing staff development training between the U.S. and Australia.

# A Comparison of Perceptions of Administrative Tasks and Professional Development Needs of Chairpersons/Heads of Departments in Australia and the U.S.

## Introduction

For several decades, faculty in tertiary education programs have engaged in staff development activities. Workshops, conferences, leaves of absence, and special seminars enable staff in the academy to develop skills for their jobs. These activities typically address the teaching needs of faculty.[1] Recent staff development trends depart from this tradition, and staff developers have acknowledged the importance of professional development needs of senior academic staff with leadership and administrative responsibilities.[2]

Professional development training is especially important for academic department chairs. Roach estimates that 80 percent of all administrative decisions in colleges occur at the department level.[3] Department chairs engage in a complex set of responsibilities involving department governance, instruction, student affairs, external communication, budget and resources, office management, and professional development of staff. [4] But chairs are not typically trained in these responsibilities. Thus, a recent trend is in-service training for chairs, and, citing examples from the U.S. and Australia, staff developers are utilizing significant training models. For example, in the U.S., at Florida State University, Tucker developed a comprehensive program of professional development activities for department chairs including twelve topics (e.g., faculty evaluation and

performance counseling).[5] This effort as well as others is discussed by Fisher.[6] In Australia, department chairs of Colleges of Advanced Education (C.A.E.) participated in a national study of staff development needs sponsored by the Australian Conference of Principals of Colleges of Advanced Education.[7] The national study provided major recommendations for department chairs in C.A.E.'s in a national 1984 report on academic staff development by the Australian Committee of Directors and Principals in Advanced Education.

With significant department chair training available in the U.S. and Australia, the question develops whether staff developers can generalize professional needs and responsibilities from one country to the other. A general analysis by Londsdale and Bardseley suggests that heads of departments in Australian colleges of advanced education have similiar professional development needs to their North American counterparts.[8] If this is true, then management specialists should encourage the exchange of models and approaches between the U.S. and Australia (and other countries).

## Objectives of the Study

The study tests whether department chair tasks and professional development needs are generalizable between Australia and U.S colleges. More specifically, this study compares perceptions of chairs from Australian C.A.E.'s, U.S. state colleges, and a U.S. university in terms of (1) the types of professional tasks in which they engage and (2) needs for professional development on these tasks. Seven dimensions

comprised the chair tasks studied: budget planning, development and control; student relations; human relations and personnel administration, curriculum and instruction, internal administration, personal/professional development, and internal/external relations. Department chairs - - a term synonmyous with department heads in this study - - are defined as those senior staff with direct administrative and academic leadership responsibilities for the conduct of a discipline and for the teaching related activities of the academic staff. [9]

It can be argued that chairs in the C.A.E.'s and the U.S. state college will engage in similiar tasks and indicate similiar needs for professional development; whereas university chairs will differ from C.A.E. and U.S. state college chairs. This argument is based on the notion of a similiar role and mission for the C.A.E.'s and the state colleges which is to provide undergraduate and first level graduate education; a strong teaching orientation (except in Australian C.A.E.'s with a multipurpose orientation); and a limited student enrollment typically under 5,000. The University studied, however, differs in that it emphases graduate education, offers majors in 74 fields, and enrolls approximately 23,000 students.

## Literature about Department Chairs

Academic departments are critical organizational units in the academy because they bear major responsibility for managing the resources, personnel and programs. It is essential, therefore, that those individuals occupying the chairs of academic departments to engage in sound management practices. Department chairs hold a pivotal role in the organization

structure of higher education. They are an "essential link between the faculty and administration at most institutions of higher education."[10] According to Hoyt and Spangler, one method for improving the quality of a college or university is to improve the quality of its department heads.[11] But improvement is difficult given the paradoxical role of chairs. Tucker comments that chairs are leaders, yet they are seldom given undisputed authority; chairs are first among equals, but a strong coalition of those equals can restrict the chair's ability to lead; deans and vice-presidents look to chairs as those primarily responsible for shaping a department's future, yet faculty in the department regard themselves as shaping the future.[12] Thus, in the words of Dressel, Johnson, and Marcus, "the position of department chairmen is vague, often misunderstood, and not clearly perceived".[13]

Unfortunately, understanding the roles and staff needs of chairs is little enhanced by the anecdotal evidence in the literature (e.g., see Brann and Emmet).[14] Fortunately, some convergence of thinking exists about the departmental tasks of chairs.[15] These tasks may include: departmental affairs, academic affairs, faculty affairs, student affairs, external communication, budgetary affairs, office management, and personal professional performance.[16] Less clear are the professional or staff development needs of chairs, though authors have begun exploring this area. For example, Smart and Elton and Creswell, Seagren, and Henry advocate the tailoring of professional development needs of chairs to specific discipline areas.[17]

Tucker demonstrates that chair tasks differ between community colleges and universities, and among departments of various size - - differences that may impact professional development needs.[18]

No consensus exists in the literature about how to identify the needs of chairs, though researchers have several options. From institutional statements of chair responsibilities researchers can draw conclusions for training programs. But job descriptions are often vague.[19] Alternatively, researchers can interview or survey superiors or subordinate administrators of chairs, or interview teaching staff.[20] In order to gain direct support for chair training programs, perhaps the best approach is to query department chairs themselves. Moreover, researchers can relate professional development needs directly to tasks in which chair engage, the technique used in the study of U.S. state college and university chairs and in the Australian study of C.A.E. chairs reported in the present study. [21]

## Method

This study reports a secondary analysis of two separate data sets utilizing a similiar survey instrument measuring department chair tasks and professional development needs. In 1979, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Task Force on Management Practices in Higher Education undertook a study of department chairs in four-year public higher education institutions in one U.S. state. Of 120 chairs in four state colleges and on one university campus, 98 participated in the study by completing a questionnaire. This participation constituted an eighty two percent return rate.

Two years later, in Australia, the Conference of Principals

of Colleges of Advanced Education commissioned a national study of department chairs in the sixty six member colleges of advanced education. Of 882 chairs contacted, 679 responded, yielding an overall response rate of 77 percent. Response rates for individual institutions ranged from 43 to 100 percent, and no identifiable relationship existed between college response rate and other institutional variables.[22]

The Australian and U.S. studies used nearly identical survey instruments developed by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Task Force in 1978, 1979. The Task Force designed an instrument on which chairs indicated for 99 tasks whether they considered each task part of their responsibilities (dichotomous questions answered by yes-no). Further, chairs checked whether the tasks should be part of their responsibilities (continuous questions on a rating scale from very little to a very great), and if they needed professional development on the tasks (a trichotomous questions on a scale from none, to some, and considerable). The Task Force derived the tasks from an extensive literature review of studies by Dressel, Johnson and Marcus, Sweitzer, Waltzer, and Thomas,[23] and field tested the instrument using responses from ten department chairs at a major land grant U.S. institution.

The instrument contains ninety nine tasks of department chairs organized into seven dimensions. These dimensions, together with illustrative items, are shown below:

(1) Budget planning, development, and control tasks

Example: Preparing and explaining departmental budget requests.

(2) Student relations and administration tasks

Example: Preparing enrollment projections

(3) Human relations and personnel administration tasks

Example: Reviewing credentials of applicants for departmental positions

(4) Curriculum and instruction tasks

Example: Conducting follow up studies of departmental graduates.

(5) Internal administration tasks

Example: Utilizing computer services for departmental management.

(6) Personal/Professional Development Tasks

Example: Requesting evaluation and feedback about my performance from departmental staff

(7) Maintenance of Internal/External Relationship Tasks

Example: Preparing departmental status reports

The Australian study used 83 of the 99 tasks, and slightly reworded several of the items. For the present study, we used only those items identical in wording between the Australian and the U.S. study, a total of 61 tasks. Further, this analysis will address whether the tasks are part of chair responsibilities and the needs for professional development, and omit additional information available on the survey instrument about whether the task should be part of chair responsibilities.

The procedure for analyzing the data from the two studies is a descriptive analysis of tasks. First the authors analyzed the overall participation of U.S. state college, U.S. university, and Australian C.A.E. chairs in 61 tasks. Then they compared the

participation of chairs noting differences and similarities among the chairs from three types of institutions. Finally, implications of the resulted were discussed for professional development training programs in the U.S. and Australia.

## Results

### Range of Administrative Tasks

Appendix A displays descriptive statistics for chair responses to the question whether chairs consider each of the 61 tasks part of their responsibilities. These responses are reported separately for chairs from the U.S. state college, U.S. university, and Australian C.A.E.'s.

As can be seen in Appendix A, chairs from C.A.E.'s report engaging in fewer tasks than chairs from state colleges or the university. Further, on many tasks, university chairs engage in fewer tasks than state college chairs. A closer inspection of the data, reanalyzed in Table 1, supports these trends. Table 1

---

Insert Table 1 Approximately Here

---

shows those tasks carried out by greater than 90% of the chairs on the three types of campuses. Thirty-nine out of 61 tasks (or 64 % of the tasks) were carried out by 90% or more of the state college chairs. In contrast, 36 out of 61 (or 59%) of the tasks were engaged in by the university chairs, and only 15 out of 61 (or 25%) of the tasks, by C.A.E. chairs. Interestingly the C.A.E. chairs felt that none of the budget planning, development and control and student relations tasks were part of their

responsibilities. They saw, however, internal/external relations (e.g., preparing departmental status reports), and to a lesser extent, human relations and personnel administration (e.g., identifying personnel needs for department programs), as major tasks in their job. State college and university chairs, on the other hand, see their tasks in a wider array of areas including budget planning, human relations and personnel administration, internal administration, personal/professional development, and internal/external relations. Thus, evidence exists to demonstrate that not all Australian and U.S. chairs engage in the same tasks. To examine this point further, Table 2 presents tasks where the chairs differed by more than 30% (an arbitrary figure, but a sizable difference nonetheless).

As shown in Table 2, on 7 of the 61 tasks, chairs from the

---

Insert Table 2 Approximately Here

---

three types of institutions differed by more than 30%. These differences are most pronounced between the state college chairs and the C.A.E. chairs (though an exception exists between university and C.A.E. chairs on supervising a system for monitoring departmental expenditures). The tasks on which state college and C.A.E. chairs differ vary; but major differences are apparent on three curriculum and instruction tasks and on the specific budgeting task of monitoring departmental expenditures.

Need for Professional Development

Appendix A presents an overall view of the chair's needs for professional development. Chairs from the U.S. state colleges

and from the C.A.E.'s indicated a greater need for professional development (as shown by the % of respondents checking "some" and "considerable" need) than chairs from the U.S. university. A closer inspection provides a more complete picture of needs for each type of institution.

Table 3 presents those tasks on which a high percentage of

---

Insert Table 3 Approximately Here

---

chairs indicated "considerable" professional development needs. The five tasks with the highest percentage of respondents for each type of institution were selected and then responses compared on these tasks for the three types of institutions. From this analysis, chairs indicated considerable professional needs in human relations, internal administration, personal and professional, and internal/external relations. To a lesser extent, the chairs expressed needs in budget planning, student relations, and curriculum and instruction. Also, chairs from all three types of institutions expressed considerable professional development needs on two tasks, utilizing computer services for departmental management and soliciting grants and outside funds for the department. In addition, university and C.A.E. chairs expressed considerable need for development in calculating space and utilization needs. Aside from these three tasks, however, the chairs from the three types of institutions displayed more dissimilarities in needs than similarities. State college chairs chairs are more concerned about making decisions concerning

retention/release and providing feedback to staff about their performance than chairs from the university and C.A.E.'s. University chairs expressed more concern about assisting faculty in research and scholarly activities than state college or C.A.E. chairs. C.A.E. chairs felt a greater need for training in requesting information about their own performance and in contracting with prospective employers for graduates than chairs from the state colleges or university.

A Comparison with Past Studies

Findings from this present study can be discussed in light of comparative Australian-U.S. trends advanced by Londsdale and Bardsley in their comprehensive study of C.A.E. chairs in Australia. [24] They first note that Australian C.A.E.'s chairs express a greater need for assistance across a wider range of tasks than North American chairs. In addition, U.S. chairs considered part of their responsibilities financial planning and management more than Australian chairs, while Australian chairs perceived greater needs in areas of staff motivation and leadership and curriculum and instruction. Finally, Londsdale and Bardsley indicate that chairs from both countries express professional development needs in utilizing computer services and solicitating outside grants for the department.

A reexamination of the U.S. data and the division of chair perceptions into U.S. state college and U.S. university responses results in several slight revisions in Londsdale and Bardsley's trends. Though chairs from all three types of institutions expressed professional development needs on all 61 tasks, state college chairs expressed greater needs over a larger range of

tasks than either the Australian or university chairs. Perhaps earlier analyses aggregating the U.S. data masked important differences between state college and university chairs. Also, it is true that U.S. chairs engage in and seek professional development assistance on financial tasks more than Australian chairs. On one task item, monitoring departmental expenditures, 64% of the state college chairs indicated "some" or "considerable" need while 47% and 41% of the university and C.A.E. chairs respectively, perceived such a need. Some evidence exists, though, that chairs in large C.A.E.'s perceive a much greater need for development on this task than chairs in smaller C.A.E.'s.

Australian studies discuss how chairs consider staff issues (i.e., personal/professional development tasks) to be the most important tasks.[25] Certainly these issues are important to Australian chairs; but, on only one task of ten in the personal/professional development area did they indicate a considerable need for development: in requesting evaluation and feedback about performance from the department. U.S. chairs, on the other hand, indicated needs on different personal/professional tasks. State college chairs are more concerned about assessing the performance of their staff rather than <u>their own performance.</u> University chairs express professional development needs in counseling and advising faculty and assisting faculty in research and scholarly activities.

Contrary to the Australian studies, professional development needs in curriculum and instruction are less important than other

tasks for C.A.E. chairs. Still, staff development in curriculum and instruction tasks for Australian and U.S. state college chairs are important, and, when "some" and "considerable" need responses are combined, chairs in U.S. state colleges and Australian C.A.E.'s expressed development needs in establishing long term goals, follow up on graduates, surveying student needs, and planning, implementing and evaluating new instructional methods. Thus, while Australian C.A.E. chairs express greater needs for development in curriculum and instruction than U.S. university chairs, the present study found C.A.E. and U.S. state college chairs very similiar in their expressed needs.

Finally, chairs from the three campuses expressed similiar professional development needs in soliciting grants and utilizing computer services. On select tasks, then, staff development needs can be generalized between the U.S. and Australia. Contrary to expectations, a general conclusion is that the state college and C.A.E. chairs differed considerably in tasks in which they engage and in professional needs.

Implications for Staff Development

The results of this study suggest several implications for the transferability of staff development training between the U.S. and Australia (and vice versa):

1. Those who engage in staff development training for chairs in Australia or the U.S. should consider deriving activities from an inspection of tasks in which chairs engage and their perceived needs for development on these tasks. Thus, trainers might consider an initial needs assessment phase of their work that includes assessing tasks utilizing an instrument

such as the one developed by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Task Force.

2. One must cautiously generalize professional development needs from U.S. campuses to Australian campuses. Several factors seem to impact this generalizability. Even within a type or sector of tertiary education, campuses differ. For example, Lonsdale and Bardsley's national Australian study detected differs in tasks and needs for C.A.E.'s categorized into large multi-purpose institutions, small multi-purpose campuses (i.e., teacher education institutions), and other mono-purpose schools.[26] Differences related to number of years experience of chairs (C.A.E. chairs were less experienced than U.S. state college or university chairs) and the size of the teaching staff under the supervision of chairs (state college chairs had larger staffs than C.A.E. or university chairs) are further potentially confounding factors. In light of these factors, the Australian Committee of Directors and Principals in Advanced Education recommended that "certain professional development objectives may only be achieved within a particular institution".[27] In North America, U.S. authors suggest careful attention to differences among academic fields of study when planning professional development programs.[28]

3. Tasks and professional development needs are continually changing. The external pressures on institutions shape the "internally oriented" and the "externally oriented" tasks of chairs. For example, in Australia, the amalgamations or mergers of C.A.E. under initiatives from the federal government in 1981,

have undoubtedly altered the roles and responsibilities of chairs. The Working Party for the Principals of C.A.E.'s in Australia acknowledges this fact and reminds Principals that colleges will operate in an environment of continuing change -- in societal expectations, in governmental polilies, and in economic, technological and sociological interrelationships.[29] In the U.S., state colleges are redefining their role within states to include a more comprehensive program, and universities as well as state colleges suffer from difficult economic times. These environmental factors - in Australia and the U.S. and other countries - encourage us to examine staff development for chair within a constantly changing environment. A professional development need for utilizing computers today may turn into space technology tomorrow.

## Conclusions

The present study is limited by the lack of direct access and comparability of the Australian and the U.S. data sets. Further, the survey instruments used in the Australian and U.S. studies are not precisely the same, though they contain 61 similiar tasks. Finally, cross cultural comparisons are never exact because of contextual or environmental differences among countries and systems of higher education.

Still, this study is a valuable contribution to the literature on department chairs because it highlights the method for assessing professional needs from an analysis of tasks. It also extends prior discussions initiated by Londsdale and Bardseley comparing the Australian and U.S. studies of department chairs. This study suggests refinements in their conclusions

based on a reanalysis of the data into chairs from three types of institutions. Finally, the study is a point of departure for generalizing training programs between Australia and the U.S.

## References


1. Blackburn, R.T., Pellino, G.R., Boberg, A. & O'Connell, C. "Are Instructional Improvement Programs Off-Target?" In Current Issues in Higher Education 1980. Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1980, 47.

2. Fisher, C.F. "The Evaluation and Development of College and University Administrators. Part Two." In Research Currents, Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, March 1977, 1.

3. Roach, J.H.I. "The Academic Department Chairperson: Functions and Responsibilities," Educational Record 57 (1976) 13.

4. Tucker, Allan. Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership Among Peers. 2nd ed. New York: American Council on Education - Macmillan Publishing Company, 1984, 2-3.

5. Ibid., 1.

6. Fisher, op. cit. (note 2) 1.

7. Lonsdale, A.J. & Bardsley, W.N. The Administrative Tasks and Professional Development Needs of Heads of Academic Departments. Canberra, Australia: Conference of Principals of Colleges of Advanced Education, 1982, viii.

8. Lonsdale, A.J. & Bardsley, W.N. "Heads of Academic Departments: Responsibilities and Professional Development Needs," Journal of Tertiary Educational Administration (October 1984) 117-127.

9. Ibid., 120.

10. Fisher, op. cit. (note 2) 1.

11. Hoyt, D.P. & Spangler, R.K. "Administrative Effectiveness of the Academic Department Head: I. The Measurement of Effectiveness." Kansas State University Research Report No. 42. Office of Institutional Research. Kansas State University, 1977, 1.

12. Tucker, op. cit. (note 4) 4.

13. Dressel, P.L., Johnson, F.C., & Marcus, P.M. The Confidence Crisis: An Analysis of University Departments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970, 84.

14. Brann, J. & Emmet, T.A. The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role. Detroit, Michigan: Balamp Publishing, 1972, 1-297.

15. For example, see Startup, R. "The Role of the Department Head," Studies in Higher Education, (1976) 233-243; Roach, op. cit. (note 3) 14-23; Tucker, op. cit. (note 4) 2-3; Weltzer, H. The Job of Academic Department Chairman. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1975, 2-3.

16. Ibid.

17. Smart, J.C. & Elton, C.F. "Administrative Roles of Department Chairmen." In Smart, J. & Montgomery, J.R. (eds) Examining Departmental Management. New Directions for Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Summer, 1976, 39-60; Creswell, J.W., Seagren, A.T., & Henry, T.C. "Professional Development Training Needs of Department Chairpersons: A Test of the Biglan Model," Planning and Changing (Winter 1979) 224-237.

18. Tucker, op. cit. (note 2) 27-37.

19. Bran & Emmet, op. cit. (note 14) 10.

20. For example, see Hoyt & Spangler, op. cit. (note 11) 1; Moses, I. "The Role of Head of Department in the Pursuit of Excellence." Higher Education (14)4, 1985, in press.

21. Seagren, A.T. "Summary Report of the Study of Academic Department Chairpersons at The University of Nebraska-Lincoln." An unpublished paper by the Task Force on Management Practices in Higher Education at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1979; Lonsdale & Bardsley, op. cit. (note 7).

22. Lonsdale & Bardsley, op. cit. (note 7) viii.

23. Dressel, Johnson & Marcus, op. cit. (note 13); Sweitzer, R. E. "The Professional Continuing Educational Needs of State College Administrators." In Edwards, C. and Pruyne, J. (eds.) The Administration of Higher Education: An assessment of Professional Needs. Columbus, Ohio, University Council on Educational Administration, 1976, 3-10; Waltzer, op. cit. (note 16); Thomas, C.F. "In-Service Needs of Department Chairpersons in AACMV Universities - A Delphi Probe." In Edwards, C.W. & Pruyne (eds.) The Administrator in Higher Education: An Assessment of Professional Needs. Columbus, Ohio: University Council on Educational Administration, 1976.

24. Londsdale & Bardsley, op. cit. (note 7); Londsdale & Bardsley, op. cit. (note 8).

25. For example, see Moses, op. cit. (note 20) 4.

26. Londsdale & Bardsley, op. cit. (note 7) 33.

27. Report of the Working Party. "Academic Staff Development in Colleges of Advanced Education." Australian Committee of Directors and Principals in Advanced Education, Reference Document No. 4, May 1984, 59.

28. Creswell, Seagren, & Henry, op. cit. (note 17) 235.

29. Report of the Working Party, op. cit. (note 27) 10.

Table 1

Distribution of Tasks Carried Out by Greater than 90% of Respondents from State Colleges, University, and C.A.E.'s

| Area | Number of Tasks in Area | Tasks Carried out by 90% or More: State Coll. # | % | Univ. # | % | C.A.E.'s # | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Budget Planning, Development and Control | 3 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Relations | 7 | 2 | 29 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| Human Relations and Personnel Administration | 9 | 7 | 28 | 8 | 89 | 3 | 33 |
| Curriculum and Instruction | 10 | 4 | 40 | 4 | 40 | 2 | 20 |
| Internal Administration | 14 | 10 | 71 | 7 | 50 | 3 | 21 |
| Personal/Professional Development | 10 | 7 | 70 | 8 | 80 | 3 | 30 |
| Internal/External Relations | 8 | 6 | 75 | 5 | 63 | 4 | 50 |
| Totals | 61 | 39 | 64 | 36 | 59 | 15 | 25 |

Table 2

Tasks Where Respondents from Three Types of Institutions Differed by More than 30%

| | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | State Universities (N=59) | Aust. C.A.E. (N=697) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | % Yes | % Yes | % Yes |
| Budget Planning, Development and Control | | | |
| Supervising a system for monitoring departmental expenditures | 97 | 90 | 45 |
| Student Relations and Administration | | | |
| Supervising maintenance of student files | 90 | 54 | 43 |
| Human Relations | | | |
| Preparing and conducting an on-going orientation program for all new departmental personnel employed | 85 | 74 | 54 |
| Curriculum and Instruction | | | |
| Supervising and coordinating the selection of instructional materials and texts | 87 | 52 | 52 |
| Conducting follow up studies of department graduates | 74 | 61 | 40 |
| Supervising the use of curriculum resources | 72 | 54 | 34 |
| Internal Administration | | | |
| Preparing requisitions for departmental purchases | 95 | 66 | 56 |

**Table 3**

**Tasks Where Professional Development Needs Are Greatest**

| Task | State Colleges % Considerable | University % Considerable | Aust. C.A.E.'s % Considerable |
|---|---|---|---|
| Human Relations and Personal Administration | | | |
| Supervising and evaluating the performance of the professional staff | 18% | 13% | 17% |
| Internal Administration | | | |
| Calculating space utilization needs | 2 | 26 | 31 |
| Utilizing computer services for departmental management | 27 | 25 | 31 |
| Making decisions concerning faculty retention/release | 17 | 7 | 6 |
| Personal/ Professional Development | | | |
| Requesting evaluation and feedback about my performance from dept. staff | 13 | 15 | 18 |
| Assist faculty in research and scholarly activities | 11 | 16 | 7 |
| Assessing and providing feedback to staff about their performance on a regular basis | 24 | 10 | 14 |
| Counseling and advising faculty | 11 | 15 | 10 |

| Task | State Colleges | University | Aust. C.A.E.'s |
|---|---|---|---|
| | % Considerable | % Considerable | % Considerable |
| <u>Maintenance of Internal/External Relationships</u> | | | |
| Soliciting grants and outside funds for the department | 45% | 26% | 23% |
| Contracting prospective employers for departmental graduates | 9 | 2 | 24 |

Note: Those tasks underlined represent the five largest percentages for state college, university, and C.A.E. respondents.

## Appendix A

### Frequency Distribution for Responses

| TASKS | Part of my responsibilities? | | | | | | Need for professional development? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | |
| | % Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C |
| **Budget Planning, Development, and Control** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Preparing and explaining departmental budget requests | 100 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 88 | 2 | 41 | 51 | 8 | 50 | 39 | 11 | 57 | 38 | 5 |
| Deciding priorities for expenditures | 100 | 0 | 98 | 2 | 88 | 12 | 49 | 49 | 2 | 66 | 30 | 4 | 63 | 32 | 5 |
| Supervising a system for monitoring departmental expenditures | 97 | 3 | 90 | 10 | 45 | 58 | 36 | 56 | 8 | 53 | 40 | 7 | 59 | 34 | 7 |
| **Student Relations and Administration** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supervising maintenance of student files | 90 | 10 | 54 | 46 | 43 | 57 | 78 | 19 | 3 | 80 | 20 | 0 | 83 | 15 | 2 |
| Making decisions concerning individual undergraduate student admissions | 37 | 63 | 27 | 73 | 59 | 41 | 78 | 19 | 3 | 82 | 16 | 2 | 77 | 19 | 4 |
| Making decisions concerning individual graduate student admissions | 49 | 51 | 72 | 28 | 54 | 46 | 78 | 22 | 0 | 78 | 22 | 0 | 78 | 18 | 4 |
| Supervising the development of an advising and counseling program for students | 69 | 31 | 67 | 33 | 63 | 27 | 58 | 26 | 16 | 50 | 48 | 2 | 56 | 38 | 6 |
| Preparing enrollment projections | 59 | 41 | 67 | 33 | 54 | 46 | 33 | 54 | 13 | 57 | 35 | 8 | 64 | 29 | 7 |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A (Cont'd.)

| TASKS | Part of my responsibilities? | | | | | | Need for professional development? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | |
| | %Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C |
| Providing for student input in departmental evaluations | 87 | 13 | 95 | 5 | 75 | 25 | 64 | 23 | 13 | 63 | 30 | 7 | 55 | 37 | 8 |
| Providing for student input into departmental curricula decisions | 90 | 10 | 85 | 15 | 75 | 25 | 71 | 24 | 5 | 68 | 32 | 0 | 59 | 35 | 6 |
| Human Relations and Personal Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Identifying personnel needs for department programs | 100 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 94 | 6 | 54 | 44 | 2 | 57 | 36 | 7 | 62 | 32 | 6 |
| Insuring that all departmental positios are described by job descriptions | 87 | 13 | 70 | 30 | 78 | 12 | 56 | 36 | 8 | 63 | 28 | 9 | 59 | 34 | 7 |
| Utilizing faculty input in the selection of departmental personnel | 97 | 3 | 98 | 2 | 87 | 13 | 82 | 15 | 3 | 72 | 23 | 5 | 71 | 27 | 2 |
| Reviewing credentials of applicnts for departmental positions | 100 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 92 | 8 | 80 | 18 | 2 | 67 | 28 | 5 | 71 | 26 | 3 |
| Recruiting new faculty | 97 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 77 | 23 | 69 | 21 | 10 | 67 | 26 | 7 | 76 | 22 | 2 |
| Interviewing prospective faculty | 97 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 93 | 7 | 74 | 16 | 10 | 67 | 26 | 7 | 59 | 36 | 5 |
| Preparing and conducting an on-going orientation program for all new departmental personnel employed | 85 | 15 | 74 | 26 | 54 | 46 | 69 | 26 | 5 | 53 | 33 | 14 | 52 | 38 | 10 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A (Cont'd)

| TASKS | Part of my responsibilities? | | | | | | Need for professional development? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | |
| | % Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C |
| Supervising and evaluating the performance of the professional staff | 100 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 86 | 14 | 54 | 28 | 18 | 50 | 37 | 13 | 39 | 44 | 17 |
| Supervising and evaluating the performance of the non-professional staff | 92 | 8 | 91 | 9 | 71 | 29 | 68 | 32 | 0 | 70 | 25 | 6 | 54 | 38 | 8 |
| Curriculum and Instruction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Establishing short terms departmental goals and objectives for curriculum and instruction | 100 | 0 | 93 | 7 | 82 | 18 | 51 | 41 | 8 | 63 | 30 | 8 | 55 | 39 | 6 |
| Establishing longer term departmental goals and objectives for curriculum and instruction | 100 | 0 | 98 | 2 | 92 | 8 | 33 | 54 | 13 | 59 | 27 | 14 | 44 | 44 | 12 |
| Establishing procedures for the development of curriculum guides, course descriptions, and objectives for the department | 97 | 3 | 93 | 7 | 80 | 20 | 56 | 41 | 3 | 54 | 44 | 2 | 49 | 43 | 8 |
| Analyzing departmental goals and objectives in relation to the mission and goals of the college/ university | 97 | 3 | 98 | 2 | 87 | 13 | 41 | 51 | 8 | 53 | 43 | 4 | 46 | 44 | 10 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| TASKS | Part of my responsibilities? U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | Need for professional development? U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C |
| Supervising and coordinating the selection of instructional materials and texts | 87 | 3 | 52 | 48 | 52 | 48 | 82 | 18 | 0 | 89 | 11 | 0 | 68 | 28 | 4 |
| Evaluating departmental goals and objectives in relation to other departments and programs within the university or college | 77 | 23 | 86 | 14 | 72 | 28 | 49 | 44 | 7 | 60 | 38 | 2 | 47 | 45 | 8 |
| Surveying student needs and interests concerning curriculum and instruction | 82 | 18 | 97 | 4 | 81 | 19 | 40 | 47 | 13 | 63 | 34 | 3 | 40 | 51 | 9 |
| Conducting follow-up studies of departmental graduates | 74 | 26 | 61 | 39 | 40 | 60 | 38 | 49 | 13 | 61 | 30 | 9 | 45 | 40 | 15 |
| Supervising the use of curriculum resources | 72 | 28 | 54 | 46 | 34 | 66 | 54 | 43 | 3 | 74 | 22 | 4 | 70 | 27 | 3 |
| Planning, implementing, and evaluating the use of new instructional materials or methods | 82 | 18 | 77 | 23 | 91 | 9 | 41 | 46 | 13 | 56 | 35 | 9 | 33 | 52 | 15 |
| <u>Internal Administration</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Preparing departmental vital statistics for internal decision-making | 92 | 8 | 98 | 2 | 73 | 27 | 55 | 37 | 8 | 62 | 33 | 5 | 61 | 32 | 7 |
| Preparing requisitions for departmental purchases | 95 | 5 | 66 | 34 | 56 | 44 | 87 | 11 | 2 | 86 | 14 | 0 | 90 | 9 | 1 |
| Calculating space utilization needs | 69 | 32 | 86 | 14 | 63 | 37 | 58 | 40 | 2 | 33 | 42 | 26 | 44 | 25 | 31 |

4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A (Cont'd)

| TASKS | Part of my responsibilities? | | | | | | Need for professional development? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | |
| | % Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C |
| Utilizing computer services for departmental management | 49 | 51 | 55 | 45 | 28 | 62 | 24 | 49 | 27 | 33 | 42 | 25 | 44 | 25 | 31 |
| Developing educational specifications for new or renovated facilities | 64 | 36 | 60 | 40 | 61 | 39 | 50 | 39 | 11 | 54 | 46 | 0 | 54 | 36 | 10 |
| Analyzing the use of time by departmental faculty and staff | 74 | 26 | 86 | 14 | 63 | 37 | 50 | 34 | 16 | 54 | 37 | 9 | 60 | 32 | 8 |
| Assessing the operating relationships among departmental personnel | 97 | 3 | 90 | 10 | 83 | 17 | 46 | 44 | 10 | 46 | 45 | 9 | 49 | 41 | 10 |
| Preparing standard operating procedures for expediting routine departmental activities | 97 | 3 | 87 | 13 | 77 | 23 | 67 | 28 | 5 | 66 | 29 | 5 | 63 | 33 | 4 |
| Making decisions relative to the organizational structure of the department | 90 | 10 | 98 | 2 | 90 | 10 | 68 | 29 | 3 | 72 | 23 | 5 | 55 | 38 | 7 |
| Utilizing data and statistics from the campus office of institutional research and planning for internal decision-making within the department | 92 | 8 | 72 | 28 | 88 | 12 | 51 | 44 | 5 | 59 | 35 | 6 | 61 | 33 | 5 |
| Delegating authority and responsibility to departmental personnel for completion of tasks | 100 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 99 | 1 | 67 | 26 | 7 | 63 | 30 | 7 | 68 | 26 | 6 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A (Cont'd)

| TASKS | Part of my responsibilities? | | | | | | Need for professional development? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | |
| | %Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C |
| Utilizing committees relative to the accomplishment of departmental functions | 97 | 3 | 95 | 5 | 90 | 10 | 67 | 26 | 7 | 73 | 25 | 2 | 69 | 25 | 5 |
| Supervising procedures for recommending tenure and promotion | 92 | 8 | 98 | 2 | 79 | 11 | 59 | 31 | 10 | 67 | 24 | 9 | 72 | 24 | 4 |
| Making decisions concerning faculty retention/release | 92 | 8 | 98 | 2 | 79 | 11 | 44 | 39 | 17 | 66 | 27 | 7 | 69 | 25 | 6 |
| **Personal/ Professional Development** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Requesting evaluation and feedback about my performance from department staff | 84 | 16 | 97 | 3 | 61 | 39 | 51 | 35 | 13 | 67 | 28 | 5 | 36 | 46 | 18 |
| Making professional presentations at state, regional and national conferences | 68 | 32 | 86 | 14 | 75 | 25 | 68 | 30 | 2 | 81 | 14 | 5 | 57 | 36 | 7 |
| Encouraging staff attendance at professional meetings | 100 | 0 | 98 | 2 | 92 | 8 | 58 | 37 | 5 | 83 | 12 | 5 | 84 | 14 | 2 |
| Assisting faculty in the securing of funds for professional development activities | 95 | 5 | 98 | 2 | 77 | 13 | 42 | 45 | 13 | 47 | 40 | 13 | 55 | 33 | 12 |
| Maintaining a professional library for department | 45 | 55 | 60 | 40 | 35 | 65 | 60 | 38 | 2 | 65 | 30 | 5 | 79 | 17 | 4 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A (Cont'd).

| TASKS | Part of my responsibilities? | | | | | | Need for professional development? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | |
| | % Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C |
| Assisting faculty in research and scholarly activities | 90 | 10 | 90 | 10 | 75 | 25 | 42 | 47 | 11 | 64 | 20 | 16 | 58 | 35 | 7 |
| Assessing and providing feedback to staff about their performance on a regular basis | 100 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 70 | 30 | 38 | 38 | 24 | 55 | 35 | 10 | 49 | 37 | 14 |
| Providing for continuous process of inquiry and discussion about the programs of the department | 97 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 93 | 7 | 49 | 41 | 10 | 67 | 23 | 10 | 50 | 41 | 9 |
| Providing opportunities for faculty to keep abreast of changes in their areas | 95 | 5 | 94 | 6 | 84 | 16 | 42 | 46 | 12 | 65 | 30 | 5 | 57 | 36 | 7 |
| Counseling and advising faculty | 95 | 5 | 100 | 0 | 92 | 8 | 35 | 54 | 11 | 53 | 32 | 15 | 46 | 44 | 10 |
| Maintenance of Internal/External Relationships | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Representing the department to the campus administration | 100 | 0 | 95 | 5 | 97 | 3 | 62 | 24 | 14 | 57 | 36 | 7 | 71 | 25 | 4 |
| Representing the department to the public | 95 | 5 | 97 | 3 | 83 | 17 | 58 | 26 | 15 | 59 | 35 | 7 | 58 | 36 | 6 |
| Interpreting campus goals and policies to departmental staff and students | 97 | 3 | 97 | 3 | 92 | 8 | 70 | 22 | 8 | 72 | 25 | 3 | 68 | 28 | 4 |
| Preparing departmental status reports | 95 | 5 | 98 | 2 | 96 | 4 | 68 | 21 | 11 | 70 | 23 | 7 | 77 | 21 | 2 |

7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A (Cont'd)

| TASKS | Part of my responsibilities? | | | | | | Need for professional development? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | U.S. State Colleges (N=39) | | | U.S. Universities (N=59) | | | Australian C.A.E.'s (N=697) | | |
| | % Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %Yes | %No | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C | %N | %S | %C |
| Mediating faculty complaints/problems with the college/ university administration | 100 | 0 | 90 | 10 | 96 | 4 | 50 | 40 | 10 | 59 | 38 | 3 | 74 | 23 | 3 |
| Mediating student complaints/problems with the college/ university administration | 100 | 0 | 79 | 21 | 86 | 14 | 55 | 34 | 11 | 62 | 38 | 0 | 78 | 20 | 2 |
| Soliciting grants and outside funds for the department | 79 | 21 | 88 | 12 | 53 | 47 | 21 | 34 | 45 | 29 | 45 | 26 | 44 | 33 | 23 |
| Contracting prospective employers for departmental graduates | 53 | 47 | 68 | 32 | 42 | 58 | 47 | 44 | 9 | 61 | 37 | 2 | 44 | 32 | 24 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE